



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,444	10/22/2003	Justin Madison	694231/0057 JJD:IGD	8007

32361 7590 10/06/2006

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
MET LIFE BUILDING
200 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10166

EXAMINER

WRIGHT, NORMAN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,444	Applicant(s) MADISON ET AL	
	Examiner Norman M. Wright	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-28 and 30-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/13/2005.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.


NORMAN M. WRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are present for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 3, having a hash that indicates access is to be denied is not clearly Understood. If the hash values match then access is confirmed, whether the value is a particular number or not a miss-match is indicates an access denial.

As to claim 33, the language of a third data being a fourth data is not this is not understood. Moreover, the third and fourth data does not appear to perform any process steps. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2134

1. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-27, 30-31, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dharmarajan U.S. Pat No. 7089585, hereinafter '585.

As per claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-27, 30-31, and 33-34 '585 teaches the claimed invention comprising: a method, system and computer readable medium for authorizing a client computer to access a server computer having: controlling access to a media file /graphic, first and second authorization tickets, a first and second hash, based upon a match of authorization tickets and data /key /time stamp/hash etc, whereas a match of the tickets and hash values equates to authentication and authorization of the users request to access said files, and a miss-match is indicative of access denial. See '585 at abs., figs. 1-2, 4-6, summary, a first and second servers (2, 14, 26), a web server, the second sever determining access, or the second sever (abs. col. 2, lines 50 et seq., col. 3, lines 60-col. 4, lines 15 et seq.), a cookie (col. 8, lines 1-5 et seq.), date/ date time stamp [present] /session length[future], expiration date [past], random /hash value, a third ticket / authentication /authorization /concatenated ticket, col. 5, lines 1-65 et seq., key / shared secret, /encryption (col. 9, lines 50 et seq.), media identifiers / cookies (col. 8, lines 1 et seq.). Hashing of first and second values are based upon a time since they are part of the concatenated tickets (col. 2, lines 15 et seq., col. 5-6, col. 7, lines 15 et seq., col. 8, lines 1 et seq., col. 9-10). A third and fourth data, message, passwords, object, additional information , email, data following a header (col. 7-8, col. 9, lines 40 et seq. and 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 28 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '585 as applied to claims 1 and 27 above, and further in view of the taking of official notice.

2. As to claims 2 and 28, permitting use to multiple file, '585 does not explicitly teach accessing multiple files. The examiner takes official notice of both the motive and modification needed to access more than a single file. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to augment the invention of '858 with an authorization ticket that allows one to access more than one media file. One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily realized that media files conventionally contain more than a single file, and that access to more than one based upon a single access credential is notoriously well known in the art. The invention of '585 stores the authentication ticket for later use (sum. et seq.), which could easily be to access a previous or other file as required by the user and as assigned by the roles of credentials. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to perform access to multiple file because, one would have readily envisaged that web pages are made up of multiple resources and hypertext links to other files. A person acquiring access to such

a web page would then be able to access the information and text-links contained within the web pages.

As to claim 9, permitting the use of a null value, '585 do not explicitly teach said limitation. The examiner takes official notice of both the motive and modification needed to utilize an arbitrary data value, here the null value, as a data value/set. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to augment the invention of '858 with an authorization ticket that allows one to generate a ticket that also has a null value as additional data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily realized that any authorization ticket could conventionally contain or be based upon more than one value, i.e. a null value. The invention of '585 recited that the hash or ticket could be based upon additional data, columns 9, lines 64 et seq, and column 10, lines 49 et seq. The use of a null value would be an arbitrary design choice, as there is nothing unique about the choosing of such a value. One of ordinary skill in the art would have realized that any data could be utilized as part of the authentication ticket as a matter or hash value, because such values are chosen to produce a desired output or function for a particular access code, ticket or attribute.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 6 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Norman M. Wright at telephone number (703) 305-9586.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Norman M. Wright whose telephone number is (703) 305-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays from 8am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron, can be reached on (703) 305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7240. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900


**NORMAN M. WRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**